

Rhode Island and on Cape Cod, I joined Dr. H. K. Svenson in a search for the plant at Parker's reputed station in New Hampshire. Our failure was recorded in 1929.¹ Subsequently, others, especially Mr. Ludlow Griscom, with his insatiable impulse to locate rare plants, have sought for the *Rynchospora* without success; and the conviction has, naturally, developed that there was some error in the record.

Reëxamination of the material said to come from East Washington shows at once that it was not labeled by Parker himself. The specimen bears a slip with Parker's "41," but the label is wholly in the hand of Scribner on a form with the caption "EX HERB. F. LAMSON SCRIBNER." Further study of the material of *R. Torreyana* by Mr. Griscom and myself reveals the fact that the specimen in question is quite inseparable, in the very dark basal sheaths, the degree of discoloration of the blades, the method of folding, the peculiar state of development and unusually small and very dark spikelets, from specimens labeled in Parker's own hand "Side of Railroad, Atsion, N. J., Sept. 26, '67." Our interpretation is, that Parker, collecting this material in September, 1867, sent some of it to Scribner as no. 41, and that soon thereafter, through a confusion of data, a specimen was labeled by Scribner as collected at East Washington in 1868 and passed on to William Boott. Mr. Bayard Long, who has sought at Philadelphia, where more of C. F. Parker's specimens are found, has been unable to find any East Washington material. In view of the facts here presented *Rynchospora Torreyana* should be removed from the list of Coastal Plain relics in New Hampshire.—M. L. FERNALD.

BRITISH SEAWEEDS.¹—The available handbooks of the Seaweeds are few and in America their number is notably limited. American algologists, whether technical students of the Marine Algae or more amateurish students of Seaweeds, will, therefore, welcome the newest work, a detailed and beautifully illustrated book of 478 pages by Dr. Lily Newton, Professor of Botany at University College, Aberystwyth. Published by the Trustees of the British Museum and thus gaining indorsement of its authoritative quality, already assured by its authorship, the book is exquisitely printed on superior paper and the figures are most satisfactorily reproduced. Analytical keys abound and the generic and specific diagnoses are clearly stated and not too long for ready understanding. With

¹ SVENSON, RHODORA, xxxi. 97 (1929).

² A Handbook of the British Seaweeds. By Lily Newton, Ph.D., F.L.S. With 270 Figures in the Text. London. The Trustees of the British Museum (Natural History), Cromwell Road, S.W. 7. 1931. Price 15 shillings.

Professor Newton's work as a guide, renewed study of our own marine algae should result. The marine forms of New England and of old England are sufficiently similar so that many of the names in the British handbook are familiar to those who have followed the eastern American work of Farlow, Hervey, Collins, Setchell and Holden. In the Algae, as in the Bryophytes and the Lichens, an authoritative work on British species is indispensable to all serious workers in America. The new handbook will, consequently, be needed by many American students.—M. L.F.

ON THE NOMENCLATURE OF ELODEA

C. A. WEATHERBY

FOR many years most standard works have used for the waterweeds of North and South America the name *Elodea* Michx. Fl. Bor. Am. i. 20 (1803). The one exception has been that followers of the American Code have employed Rafinesque's substitute name *Philotria*.

Under the old International Rules *Elodea* could be retained. It differed from *Elodes* Adans. (1763) by the required "one letter" "in the termination" (Art. 58); and the earlier *Elodeas* of Jussieu (1789) and Ventenat (1799) were variants of Adanson's name, ascribed to him, were therefore illegitimate and could be disregarded. But under the homonym rule adopted at the Cambridge Congress in 1930 illegitimacy, in cases like this, is glorified. Dogs-in-the-manger are sanctified; a name which can never be used in the sense in which it was proposed can prevent the use of the same name in another sense, even though it may have been long established and without impediment therein. Thus a large number of serviceable and familiar names, *Elodea* among them, are, unreasonably, wiped out.

Elodea, then, passes, to the accompaniment of eight new combinations. In choosing its successor, taxonomic considerations come into play. If the genus is taken in the sense of Caspary, Bentham & Hooker, Engler & Prantl and Dalla Torre & Harms, to include both dioecious and hermaphrodite species, the earliest available name applicable to any part of it is *Anacharis* Rich., proposed in a paper read before the Institute at Paris Jan. 14, 1812, and published in Part 2 of the *Mémoires de la Classe des Sciences Mathématiques et Physiques* for 1811, which is usually dated 1812, but according to Caspary¹ was not actually issued until 1814. *Philotria*, Rafinesque's renaming of *Elodea* Michx. because of "*Elodea*" Adans., did not arrive until

¹ Pringsh. Jahrb. Wiss. Bot. 425 (1858).